Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/803,726	QUENZI, PHILIP J.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LEE D. WILSON	3723
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) LEE D. WILSON.	(3)	
(2) <u>Karl T. Ondersma</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 13 September 2006	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: All rejections of record		
Claims discussed: All art of record		
Prior art documents discussed: US-3,942,249 and all other art of record	·	
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	ERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summand the provide is the provide and provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. 	the examiner will provide a written record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	nt/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant contacted the examiner to present arguments where the invention reads over the prior art because the rotational and cam member rotate and lock the blade where as the prior art has a lock that abuts the blade. The application is in conditions for allowance and the record is complete and there is no need for the applicant to submit a summary of the interview because the record is complete.

LEE D. WILSON PRIMARY EXAMINER